



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,378	01/07/2002	Jae Ho Jung	LT-0010	5573
34610 7590 04/03/2008 KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, VA 20153-1200				
EXAMINER				
BASEHOAR, ADAM L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/036,378

Applicant(s)

JUNG, JAE HO

Examiner

Adam L. Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23-25, 27-35 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23-25, 27-35 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The RCE filed 10/04/07.
2. Claim 36 has been cancelled as necessitated by Amendment.
3. The rejection of claims 1-21 and 23-25, and 27-37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan et al (US-6,272,545 08/07/01) in view of Pendleton (US-2004/0139076 07/15/04) in further view of Ellard (US-5,999,937 12/07/99) has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
4. Claims 1-21 and 23-25, 27-35, and 37 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 13, 18, 25, and 33, are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
6. Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 33-35 recite a PDA comprising merely a plurality software application programs. Software programs do not fall within a statutory class. The software application programs must be claimed in combination with an appropriate hardware device in order for their functionality to be realized (Note independent claim 25, which includes a plurality of appropriate hardware devices such as a CPU or memory). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-12, 18-21, 23-25, 27-35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagin et al (US-6,272,545 08/07/01) in view of Ellard (US-5,999,937 12/07/99).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 18, and 33, Flanagin teaches a method or storing data in a personal information terminal, comprising:

composing data in a first APP (column 2, lines 63-65; column 13, lines 25-32) of a plurality of APPs (column 2, lines 63-65; column 13, lines 25-32) embedded in the personal information terminal (column 13, line 21: "PIM 5A")(Fig. 1), the data being in a first format (column 11, lines 60-67; column 12, lines 1-14; column 13, lines 25-32: "A predefined set of properties is supported for each object type");

wherein each of the plurality of application programs were selectively initiated and executed in the personal information terminal (column 2, lines 62-65; column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32),

wherein the first application program was a document editing program ("electronic email messages" or "communications" or "word processing") and the second APP was one of a calendar application ("appointments" or "scheduling") or "tasks" application (column 1, lines 36-38; column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32);

wherein contents of the first data format entered in the first application program in the PDA are stored as re-formatted data of the second data format in the second database in the PDA to match the second database to the first database while the first application program was executed (column 12, lines 19-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. Flanagan teaches automatically updating data between two different databases when the two databases are connected as well as teaches always maintaining a connection between the two different databases).

Flanagan does not specifically teach converting a format of the composed data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program of the plurality of APPs using a conversion program; and storing the format-converted data in a database associated with the second APP, the conversion program was initiated and executed on the PIM, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any of any other of the plurality of application programs. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer system including a first and second database (column 2, lines 29-33: "system transfers data between one or more input data sets...and one or more output data sets")(Fig. 1) as well as conversion routines (Fig. 3) for converting from the first data format of the first database (column 2, lines 29-33: "input data sets...having different data formats") to the second different format (column 2, lines 29-33: "output data sets...have a different data format") of the data set for data being transferred to the second data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also teaches conversion programs capable of converting data from any one of a plurality of data types into a format of any other data type (column 2, lines 28-42: "configuration data to convert and transfer any type of data into any other type of data"). Ellard further teaches wherein the

conversion program was executed on by the computer system (i.e. equivalent to PIM)(column 3, lines 37-48: “data exchange system may be a software application being executed by a computer system”; column 5, lines 6-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan have been executed a conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application, because Ellard teaches that by being able to automatically convert any format to any other format a user would be spared the significant amount of time necessary to write a custom software application to transfer and convert data between different data sets (column 1, lines 23-26). Ellard also taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: “integrity....entry errors”). This process would have benefited Flanagan which had a desire that at least some of the objects on the application data stores be either copied or transferred to other stores in order that the user can access the same information. In this way the user of Flanagan would have been able to access related or similar information across a plurality of executing application programs.

-In regard to dependent claims 2-3, and 20 Flanagan teaches wherein the data format (column 13, lines 25-32: “each object type”) of each APP program (column 13, lines 25-32: “appointments”, “tasks”, email, etc.) was different from a data format of the other APPs (column 13, lines 25-32: “predefined set of properties is supported for each object type” and “distinct”) and wherein each APP had an associated database to store data composed in the corresponding

APP (column 13, lines 25-32: "distinct database"). Flanagan also teaches wherein database fields where utilized to store data (column 12, line 3: "plurality of fields"). Flanagan does not specifically teach utilizing a delimiter between portions of data in the data block to indicate a new field. The Examiner notes that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time of the invention for delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the benefit of separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record (Note: Ellard Reference).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 23, 27, and 34 Flanagan teaches wherein the PIM had a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32) wherein the first APP was a document editing program ("electronic email messages") and the second APP was one of a calendar application ("appointments") or "tasks" application, and wherein the first and second databases are matched without data entry into the second application program (Flanagan: column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. via the synchronization manager)(Ellard: column 7, lines 7-31)(Fig. 4).

-In regard to dependent claim 5, Flanagan teaches composing data in the first APP (column 13, lines 25-32).

Flanagan does not teach selecting a second APP in which to store the composed data. Ellard teaches selecting a second APP in which to store the composed data (column 2, lines 27-65)(Figs 2 & 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and

stored as data in a selected second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

-In regard to dependent claims 6, 19, 21, and 29-30, Flanagan does not teach providing an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP; and assigning data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP, wherein the input window includes sub-windows. Ellard teaches providing an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP and assigning data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP (column 7, lines 7-63: "input data gathered by reviewing data from the input data...formats of the data records and fields determined...analyze the input data to determine what conversions are required"; column 8, lines 26-32: e.g. "member's birthday" date format). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan to have provided an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP; and assigning data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

-In regard to dependent claims 7 and 24, Flanagan teaches composing data in the first APP (column 13, lines 25-32).

Flanagin does not teach selecting a data block in the composed data and choosing the second APP in which to store the data of the selected block. Ellard teaches selecting a data block in the composed data and choosing the second APP in which to store the data of the selected block (column 4, lines 13-34; column 7, lines 7-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored as data in a second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Flanagin does not teach wherein a written order of words or phrases constituting the data in the data block was matched with a data field order of the database associated with the second APP. Ellard teaches wherein a written order of words or phrases constituting the data in the data block was matched with a data field order of the database associated with the second APP (column 7, lines 63-67; column 8, lines 1-32: "data field of the input data set may be converted into the output database format and then inserted into the data field in the output data base"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed a written order of words or phrases constituting the data in the data block was matched with a data field order of the database associated with the second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Flanagan teaches database objects containing records of data for distinct APPs (column 13, lines 25-32). Flanagan also teaches wherein database fields where utilized to store data (column 12, line 3: "plurality of fields"). Flanagan does not specifically teach wherein a delimiter between portions of data in the data block indicate a new field. The Examiner notes that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time of the invention for delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the benefit of separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record.

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Flanagan does not teach wherein a beginning of the data block includes an identifier code to identify the second APP in which to store the data. Ellard teaches wherein a beginning of the data block includes an identifier code to identify the second APP in which to store the data (column 7, lines 63-67; column 8, lines 1-32: "code that identifies...number...uniquely identifies"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan to have a beginning of the data block includes an identifier code to identify the second APP in which to store the data, because Ellard taught that being able to identify where the input data set was going to be converted, the user could convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

-In regard to dependent claims 11 and 12, Flanagan does not teach wherein the composed data comprises a specific data item to indicate the second APP to which composed data is to be stored, and wherein converting the format of the composed data converts the format

of the composed data to the format specific in the second APP, based on the specific data item in the composed data, wherein the specific data item was initially fixed according to a prescribed rule, and wherein the specific data item was changeable by a user. Ellard teaches wherein the composed data comprises a specific data item to indicate the second APP to which composed data is to be stored (column 7, lines 6-31 & 58-67; column 8, lines 1-35), and wherein converting the format of the composed data converts the format of the composed data to the format specific in the second APP based on the specific data item in the composed data (column 8, lines 26-35: "converted into the output database format"), wherein the specific data item was initially fixed according to a prescribed rule (column 2, lines 35-40: "standard conversion routines"), and wherein the specific data item was changeable by a user (column 2, lines 35-40: "customized conversion routines...by the operator of the system"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan to have included an identifier code of the second APP, because Ellard teaches without the identification code, there would be no way to determine the identity of the output data set and the corresponding output data format.

-In regard to independent claim 25, Flanagan teaches a method or storing data in a personal information terminal, comprising:

an input/output interface (Fig. 3) configured to receive commands and display information (column 6, lines 25-45);

a central processing unit configured to receive and process commands entered into the data (column 6, lines 25-45: "PDA");

a memory configured to accommodate a plurality of databases (column 13, lines 25-32: “different databases”) associated with a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32: “appointments”, “tasks”, etc), wherein a first APP stored on the PIM is configured to receive and store data in a first database using a first format and a second APP on the PDA configured to receive and store data in a second database using a second format (column 13, lines 25-32: “A predefined set of properties is supported for each object type”).

Flanagan also teaches wherein contents of the first data format entered in the first application program in the PDA are stored as re-formatted data of the second data format in the second database in a PDA to match the second database to the first database while the first application program was executed (column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. Flanagan teaches automatically updating data between two different databases when the two databases are connected as well as teaches always maintaining a connection between the two different databases).

Flanagan does not teach a conversion program to receive data in a first format, reformat the received data to the second format, and store the reformatted data in a second database. Flanagan also does not teach wherein the first application program, the conversion program conversion program was initiated and executed on the personal information terminal, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer system including a first and second database as well as conversion routines for converting from the first data format of the database to the second different format of the data set for data being transferred to the second data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also

teaches conversion programs capable of converting data from any one of a plurality of data types into a format of any other data type (column 2, lines 28-42: “configuration data to convert and transfer any type of data into any other type of data”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan have been capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application, because Ellard teaches that by being able to automatically convert any format to any other format a user would be spared the significant amount of time necessary to write a custom software application to transfer and convert data between different data sets (column 1, lines 23-26). Ellard also taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: “integrity....entry errors”).

-In regard to dependent claims 28 and 35, Flanagan does not teach wherein the conversion program performs one of a manual and automatic conversion of data. Ellard teaches wherein the conversion program performs one of a manual and automatic conversion of data (column 7, lines 7-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for Flanagan to have utilized a manual or automatic conversion program, because Ellard teaches that both methods provide a user-intuitive method for converting and storing data into a different format (column 1, lines 26-30: “integrity....entry errors”).

-In regard to dependent claims 31 and 32, Flanagan teaches wherein the input/output interface comprises a touch screen (column 6, lines 25-45)(Fig. 3). Flanagan does not teach

automatic conversion of data by determining an application program into which the data was to be stored and determining the individual data fields within the data, wherein prescribed portions of the data to be converted contain identification markers to indicate the APP into which the data was to be stored and wherein delimiters in the data indicate a beginning of at least one data field. Ellard teaches automatic conversion of data by determining an application program into which the data was to be stored and determining the individual data fields within the data, wherein prescribed portions of the data to be converted contain identification markers to indicate the APP into which the data was to be stored and wherein delimiters in the data indicate a beginning of at least one data field (column 1, lines 29-31; column 2, lines 27-60; column 7, lines 7-31 & 63-67; column 8, lines 1-35). It would have been obvious for Flannigan to have incorporated said features of Ellard for the same rational as given above. Wherein Flanagan does not specifically teach delimiters between portions of data in the data block to indicate a new field, the Examiner notes that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time of the invention for delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the benefit of separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record.

-In regard to dependent claim 37, Flanagan teaches wherein each of the first and second application programs are operated in the personal information terminal (Fig. 1: 5A, 5B, 5C) to respectively display data stored in the first and second application programs (column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 27-32).

9. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan et al (US-6,272,545 08/07/01) in view of Crozier (US-5,392,390 02/21/95) of Ellard (US-5,999,937 12/07/99).

-In regard to independent claim 13, Flanagan teaches composing data in a first one of a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32), wherein each of the plurality of application programs was selectively operated in the personal information terminal (column 2, lines 62-65; column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32).

Flanagan further teaches wherein operating the first application program using a first procedure to enter data in the first application program (column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32) and operating the first application program using a second procedure to enter data in the first application and the second application program database (column 12, lines 19-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28).

Flanagan does not teach having a prescribed identifier code being indicative of a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be stored; selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed ID codes; converting a first format to a second format; and storing the data in a database associated with the second APP. Crozier teaches having a prescribed identifier code being indicative of a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be stored (column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56: "DT Application specifies the...application name"); selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed ID codes (column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56); converting a first format to a second format (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66); and

storing the data in a database associated with the second APP (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored as data in a second APP, because Crozier teaches that doing so would allow translating data between a wide variety of applications while ensuring that the data need only be entered once (column 3, lines 27-30).

Flanagan also does not teach wherein the conversion program was initiated and executed on the personal information terminal, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of applications. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer system including a first and second database as well as conversion routines for converting from the first data format of the database to the second different format of the data set for data being transferred to the second data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also teaches conversion programs capable of converting data from any one of a plurality of data types into a format of any other data type (column 2, lines 28-42: "configuration data to convert and transfer any type of data into any other type of data"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan have been capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application, because Ellard teaches that by being able to automatically convert any format to any other format a user would be spared the significant amount of time necessary to write a custom software application to transfer and convert data between different data sets (column 1, lines 23-26). Ellard also taught

that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: “integrity....entry errors”).

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Crozier teaches wherein the prescribed identifier code specifies a data section including a part of the composed data (column 8, lines 40-65: “HH Field Name”), and wherein converting the format of the composed data converts the data in the specified data section to the second format (column 3, 9-15: “mapping and translating the data to the formats expected by a second computer application”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagan to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored as data in a second APP, because Crozier teaches that doing so would allow translating data between a wide variety of applications while ensuring that the data need only be entered once (column 3, lines 27-30).

-In regard to dependent claims 15-16, Flanagan teaches wherein the data format (column 13, lines 25-32: “each object type”) of each APP program (column 13, lines 25-32: “appointments”, “tasks”, email, etc.) was different from a data format of the other APPs (column 13, lines 25-32: “predefined set of properties is supported for each object type” and “distinct”) and wherein each APP had an associated database to store data composed in the corresponding APP (column 13, lines 25-32: “distinct database”). Flanagan also teaches wherein database fields were utilized to store data (column 12, line 3: “plurality of fields”). Flanagan does not specifically teach utilizing a delimiter between portions of data in the data block to indicate a new field. The Examiner notes that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time

of the invention for delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the benefit of separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record (Note: Ellard Reference).

-In regard to dependent claim 17, Flanagan teaches wherein the PIM had a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32) wherein the first APP was a document editing program ("electronic email messages") and the second APP was one of a calendar application ("appointments") or "tasks" application, and wherein the first and second databases are matched without data entry into the second application program (Flanagan: column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. via the synchronization manager)(Ellard: column 7, lines 7-31)(Fig. 4).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 13, 18, 25, 33, and 36, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

-In general, the Applicant argues that neither Flanagan nor Pendleton teaches or suggest initiating and executing a conversion program on the information terminal capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any other of the plurality of application programs. The Examiner agrees with the Applicant that these new limitations are not specifically recited in either Flanagan or Pendleton. However, the Examiner believes that the newly applied Ellard reference teaches said limitations. Ellard teaches the benefits of having conversion programs for converting data in any type of format in a first

database to data of any type of format of a second database to which the first data was to be transferred. Ellard further teaches wherein the first database, second database, and conversion programs could all be part of the same computer system or that any one part of the system could be external to the other parts. Ellard finally teaches wherein the databases could represent data of different application programs.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Please note the additionally cited references on the accompanying PTO-892 Form.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Baschoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Adam L Baschoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178